

management system. See Loaiza, Col. 3, lines 58-67. The Office Action further points to sections within Loaiza that describe an array data structure in memory (Col. 6, lines 15-35), a hash table data structure (Col. 6, lines 35-58), and a linked list data structure (Col. 6, line 66- Col. 7, line 7).

However, Loaiza does not describe nor suggest that each of these data structures is employed **in parallel**. This point of distinction is significant, because unlike the cited references, the present invention recites storing each data object as being separately and in parallel referenced in each of the plurality of data structure types. See Applicants' specification, page 5 lines 21-23. This unique implementation enables the invention to then automatically determine one of the plurality of data structure types best suited to retrieve the one data object. Loaiza, on the other hand, provides that any one of these data structures may be employed, but does not suggest nor disclose employing them in parallel for each data object in the data store. Therefore, Loaiza, simply can not and does not suggest nor disclose automatically determining the data structure type best suited, as is claimed by amended Claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Loaiza does not render the claimed invention obvious.

Moreover, because Loaiza does not suggest or disclose the claimed limitations of amended claim 1 as is suggested by the Office Action, the combination of Loaiza with Cochrane also does not render the claimed invention obvious.

In addition, because amended independent Claims 14, 17, 21-23, and 26 include similar limitations as Claim 1, albeit different, they are also allowable for at least substantially the same reasons as independent Claim 1.

In regard to Claims 2-13, 15-16, 18-20, 24-25, and 27 which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 23, and 26 respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicant believes that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: March 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jamie L. Wiegand

Registration No.: 52,361

Customer No.: 38878

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant